

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/994,761	11/28/2001	Hiroaki Sugiura	1190-0532P	1204	
2292	7590 09/22/2006		EXAMINER		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			EBRAHIMI DEH	EBRAHIMI DEHKORDY, SAEID	
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHUI	RCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2625		
			DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006	DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/994,761	SUGIURA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy	2626				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed n the mailing date of this com ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06.	lulv 2006					
		is action is non-final.					
'—	Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the r	merits is			
,	closed in accordance with the practice under	•					
Dispositi	on of Claims	•					
4)⊠	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
	on Papers	·					
	The specification is objected to by the Examin	or.					
· —	•		Evaminer				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			0 1 101/4\			
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).	•			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	., (=, =, (.,,				
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	its have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen		tion No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price			tage			
	application from the International Burea			ago			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a lis		ed.				
		, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		·			
Attachment	(s)						
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal I	Patent Application				
		٠, <u>١</u>					

Application/Control Number: 09/994,761

Art Unit: 2626

Double Patenting

Page 2

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,980,325. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitation of the application are conceptually the same and not distinct from the claim 1 of the said patent. Limitation receiving from the provider over the communication channel original image, and receiving from said provider over the communication channel the along with the original image the tag data, and converting through the output device, and converting image data into a visually-perceptible analog thereof are note distinct from the limitations the claim 1 of the patent 6,980,325.
- 3. Claim 5 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,980,325. Claim 5 limitations are

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/994,761

Art Unit: 2626

conceptually are not distinct from the claim 10 of the patent 6,980,325, limitations such as receiving from the provider original image, monitoring the presence of the tag data, presuming if no tag data is received, converting the original data to the into second color space, converting converted image into a visually-perceptible analog thereof.

- 4. Claim 13 of the present application is conceptually same as claim 1 of the said US patent.
- 5. Claim 15 of the present application is conceptually the same as claim 10 of the said US patent.

Contact Information

➤ Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy whose telephone number is (571) 272-7462.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams, can be reached at (571) 272-7471.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for *formal* communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 306-5406 (for *informal* or *draft* communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2626

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Knox building on 501 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy Patent Examiner Group Art Unit 2626 September 6, 2006

> KING Y. POON PRIMARY EXAMINER